IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appl. No.	:	10/033,328	Confirmation No.	9602
Applicant	:	Patek		
Filed	:	11/2/2001		
TC/A.U.	:	2153		
Examiner	:	Strange		
Docket No.	:	I000-P02158US		
Customer No.	:	33356		

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF

Dear Sir:

The following Appeal Brief is submitted pursuant to the Notice of Appeal dated 5/17/2006 for consideration by the Board of Appeals and Interferences. 37 C.F.R. § 41.37.

(i) REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is Internet Machines Corp.

(ii) RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no applications currently being appealed that may directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(iii) STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-25 were pending and rejected in the Final Office Action dated 11/17/2005. Claims 1-25 are pending and are the subject of this appeal.

(iv) STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendment has been filed subsequent to the final rejection.

(v) SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Independent Claim 1:

A method for sending a data item from a source to selected destinations of a plurality of destinations in a switching network, said method comprising (p. 2, ll. 18-19; FIG. 6)[1]: examining said data item to determine a routing identifier for said data item (p. 2, ll. 20-21; FIG. 6, 520); using said routing identifier as an index, accessing a data structure comprising routing control values for said plurality of destinations (p. 2, ll. 21-22; FIG. 6, 522); and concurrently transferring said data item from said source to said selected destinations based on said routing control values (p. 2, ll. 22-24; FIG. 6, 524-534).

[1] References are to the application as filed pursuant to 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(v).

Independent Claim 8:

A method for multicasting a frame in a router, said router comprising an input queue and a plurality of output queues, said method comprising (p. 2, ll. 25-27; FIG. 2; FIG. 5; FIG. 6): determining a destination identifier for said frame received by said input queue (p. 2, ll. 27-28; FIG. 6, 520; FIG. 5, 420); using said destination identifier, locating a data structure comprising a mask for said plurality of output queues (p. 2, ll. 28-29 & p. 3, ll. 1; FIG. 5, 430; FIG. 6, 522); and concurrently transferring a reference to said frame to at least two selected output queue controllers in accordance with said mask (p. 3, ll. 1-2; FIG. 6, 524-534).

Independent Claim 14:

A multicasting system in a switching fabric for routing data in a frame received at an input queue to a plurality of selected output queues, comprising (p. 3, ll. 3-5; FIG. 1; FIG. 6): a table having a plurality of predetermined routes, said table addressed by a destination ID in said frame, and said table comprising a mask corresponding to said destination ID (p. 3, ll. 5-7; FIG. 6, 512; FIG. 6, 522); a memory for storing said mask, said mask indicating said plurality of selected output queues (p. 3, ll. 7-8; FIG. 6, 524); and selected output queue control modules for said plurality of selected output queues, said selected output queue control modules used for copying said data to said plurality of selected output queues (p. 3, ll. 8-11; FIG. 6, 524-534).

Independent Claim 22:

A system for multicasting a frame in a router having a plurality of input ports and a plurality of output ports, comprising (p. 3, ll. 12-13; FIG. 2): a first crossbar switch for transferring said frame from an input port of said plurality of input ports to a shared memory (p. 3, ll. 13-15; FIG. 2, 150); a frame pointer for referencing said frame stored in said shared memory (p. 3, ll. 15-16; FIG. 2, 160); a second crossbar switch for transferring said frame using said frame pointer to a plurality of selected output ports of said plurality of output ports (p. 3, ll. 16-17; FIG. 2, 154); and a control unit for selecting said plurality of selected output ports using a multicast data structure having predetermined multicast routes (p. 3, ll. 17-19; FIG. 4, 430).

Independent Claim 25:

A method for sending a frame from a source to selected destinations of a plurality of destinations in a router, said method comprising (p. 2, ll. 18-20; FIG. 6): means for examining said frame to determine a destination identifier for said frame (p. 2, ll. 20-21; FIG. 6, 520); using said destination identifier as an index, means for accessing a data structure comprising a mask for said plurality of destinations (p. 2, ll. 21-22; FIG. 6, 522); and means for concurrently transferring at least one portion of said frame from said source to said selected destinations based on said mask (p. 2, ll. 22-24; FIG. 6, 524-534).

(vi) GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claims 1-7, 8-13, 14-21, 22, 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sindhu (US 6,493,347). Specifically, the office action asserted that Sindhu discloses the following two limitations:

> "using said routing identifier as an index, accessing a data structure comprising routing control values for said plurality of destinations"
>
> "concurrently transferring said data item from said source to said selected destinations based on said routing control values"

However, as discussed in the Argument section below, claims 1-7, 8-13, 14-21, 22, 24 and 25 are patentable over Sindhu.

Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sindhu in view of Sakamoto et al. (US 6,836,479). Specifically, the office action asserted that Sindhu teaches the following two limitations:

> "plurality of selected output ports"
>
> "multicast data structure having predetermined multicast routes"

However, as discussed in the Argument section below, claim 23 is patentable over Sindhu in view of Sakamoto.

(vii) ARGUMENT

A. Rejection of Claims 1-7, 8-13, 14-21, 22, 24 & 25 under 102(e) as anticipated by Sindhu et al. (US Patent 6,493,347).

To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach each and every element of the claim. MPEP §2131 provides:

> A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. [. . .] The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.

As such, in order to assert that a single prior art reference anticipates a claim, the office action needs to show that each and every element is disclosed, either expressly or inherently, in the prior art reference. In this case, the office action fails to show that Sindhu discloses, either expressly or inherently, each and every limitation as recited in the claims. Therefore, the rejection shall be reversed for failing to sufficiently make a prima facie case of anticipation. In addition, the claims are patentable over Sindhu as Sindhu does not disclose, either expressly or inherently, each and every limitation recited in the claims. Therefore, as shown in the arguments below, the claims are patentable over Sindhu.

Claim 1

Claim 1 is patentable over Sindhu as Sindhu does not disclose each and every limitation recited in claim 1. Independent claim 1 recites at least two limitations not disclosed, either expressly or inherently, by Sindhu.

First, claim 1 recites, among other limitations, "using said **routing identifier** as an **index**, accessing a data structure comprising **routing control values for said plurality of destinations**". (emphasis added). The office action asserts that Sindhu teaches this limitation. Sindhu discloses a method wherein a look-up engine performs a "trie based search" based on the key information and returns a result which includes the output multiport associated with the destination. (Sindhu, col. 6, lines 18-21). However, performing a search using "key information" is not the same as "using said

routing identifier as an index". Further, using a "look-up engine" is not the same as "accessing a data structure **comprising routing control values** for said **plurality of destinations**". (emphasis added). Thus, while Sindhu teaches performing a search based on the key identified in the data packet using a look-up engine, Sindhu does not teach, "using said routing identifier as an index, accessing a data structure comprising routing control values for said plurality of destinations". Therefore, because Sindhu does not disclose every limitation recited in claim 1, claim 1 is patentable over Sindhu. As such, the anticipation rejection of claim 1 should be reversed.

Second, claim 1 recites, among other limitations, "concurrently transferring **said data item** from said source to **said selected destinations** based on said routing control values." (emphasis added). The office action asserts that Sindhu discloses this limitation. (Office Action, page 4). Sindhu teaches "a notification may be sent to more than one multi-function multiport resulting in the broadcast of the associated packet." (Sindhu, col. 17, lines 13-15). Sindhu further discloses that the notification "includes a result which indicates the multi-function multiport to be used in the transfer of the packet to its destination." (Sindhu, col. 17, lines 2-4). As such, Sindhu discloses sending a **notification** to more than one multi-function multiport, but does not disclose "concurrently transferring **said data item** from **said source to said selected destinations** based on said routing control values." (emphasis added). Further, in response to applicant's assertion that Sindhu's system is limited to transferring data between a single destination and a single multiport, the office action asserts that Sindhu teaches plural multiports. (Office Action, page 13). However, while Sindhu teaches plural multiports at col. 6, line 1, Sindhu does not teach using plural multiports in the manner claimed. More specifically, Sindhu does not teach transferring the data item from one source to multiple "selected destinations". Therefore, because Sindhu does not disclose every limitation recited in claim 1, claim 1 is patentable over Sindhu. As such, the anticipation rejection of claim 1 should be reversed.

For all of the reasons set forth above, the rejection of claim 1 should be reversed.

Further, by virtue of their dependency on claim 1, claims 2-7 are patentable over Sindhu. As such, the anticipation rejection of claims 2-7 should be reversed.

Claim 8

As to claim 8, the office action fails to show that Sindhu teaches every limitation recited in claim 8 "in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim", as required by MPEP 2131. Further, the office action fails to clearly identify what portions of Sindhu teach all of the claimed limitations as required by 37 CFR 1.104(c)(2). Moreover, Sindhu fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, the limitations recited in claim 8. As such, the rejection of claim 8 should be reversed for at least the following five reasons.

First, the office action's assertion that Sindhu teaches every limitation recited in claim 8 is based on merging teachings from unrelated portions of Sindhu. 37 CFR 1.104(c)(2) provides:

> "When a reference is complex or shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the applicant, the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable. The pertinence of each reference, if not apparent, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified."

Therefore, the office action needs to clearly explain the "particular part" relied on when rejecting a claim. Here however, the office action combines teachings from cols. 6 and 17 as well as FIGS. 2A, 2B, 3A, 3C, 14. Specifically, col. 6 and col. 17 of Sindhu relate to different aspects of the embodiments disclosed in Sindhu. For example, col. 6 describes functionality for a router, while col. 17 describes "a data structure associated with the notification outputted by the controller to the output switch". (Sindhu, col. 17, lines 5-7). Further, the cited figures relate to different embodiments of Sindhu. In particular, some of the cited figures are unrelated to the embodiments described in cols. 6 and 17. For example, FIGS. 3A and 3C relate to a multi-function multiport and a data structure for a cell transferred between a multi-function port and an input switch (Sindhu, col. 4, lines, 30-31 and col. 4, lines 35-37), and FIG. 14 relates to an output request transferred from the controller to the output switch. (Sindhu, col. 5, lines 26-28). As such, the office action fails to clearly explain which "particular part" of Sindhu discloses the limitations of claim 8 as required by 37 CFR 1.104(c)(2). Therefore, because the office action fails to make a prima facie case of anticipation, the rejection should be reversed.

Second, the office action fails to show where Sindhu teaches "concurrently transferring a reference to said frame to at least two selected output queue controllers in accordance with said mask" as recited in claim 8. The office action states that "a reference" is taught by Fig. 14 of Sindhu, "frame" is taught by "packet cell" of Sindhu, and "output queue controllers" is taught by "read request queue" of Sindhu. However, the office action does not show where Sindhu teaches the limitation in the manner recited in claim 8. That is, the office action fails to show where Sindhu teaches "**concurrently transferring** a reference to said frame to **at least two selected** output queue controllers in accordance with said mask" in the manner recited in claim 8. (emphasis added). As such, the office action fails to clearly explain which "particular part" of Sindhu discloses the limitations of claim 8 as required by 37 CFR 1.104(c)(2). Therefore, because the office action fails to make a prima facie case of anticipation, the rejection should be reversed.

Third, Sindhu does not disclose the limitation "at least two selected **output queue controllers**". (emphasis added). The office action asserts that the "read request queues" of FIG. 3A in Sindhu teaches this limitation. However, Sindhu teaches "read requests are sent by the output request processor to an appropriate read request queue" and "one read request queue is provided for each bank of memory." (Sindhu, col. 20, lines 15-18). Thus, the read request queues disclosed in Sindhu receive read requests from an output request processor. But the read request queues do not aid in "transferring a reference to said frame to **at least two** selected output queue controllers in accordance with said mask". (emphasis added). That is, the read request queues are not the same as the claimed "output queue controllers". As such, because Sindhu does not teach every limitation of claim 8, claim 8 is patentable over Sindhu.

Fourth, the office action does not clearly identify where Sindhu teaches "output queues". Claim 8 contains limitations of "output queues" and "output queue controllers". Claim 8 recites, "using said destination identifier, locating a data structure comprising a mask for said **plurality of output queues**" and "concurrently transferring a reference to said frame to at least two selected **output queue controllers** in accordance with said mask". (emphasis added). The office action asserts that both the "output queues" and the "output queue controllers" are taught by "multi-function multiports". (Office Action, page 13-14). Then, the office action asserts that the "output queue

controllers" are taught by the read request queues. (Office Action, page 5). However, the office action fails to clearly show where Sindhu teaches the claimed limitations. That is, the office action fails to clearly or sufficiently show where Sindhu teaches "using said destination identifier, locating a data structure comprising a mask for said **plurality of output queues**" and "concurrently transferring a reference to said frame to at least two selected **output queue controllers** in accordance with said mask". (emphasis added). As such, the office action fails to clearly explain which "particular part" of Sindhu discloses the limitations of claim 8 as required by 37 CFR 1.104(c)(2). Therefore, because the office action fails to make a prima facie case of anticipation, the rejection should be reversed.

Fifth, Sindhu does not disclose, either expressly or inherently, the limitation of claim 8 which recites, "concurrently transferring a reference to said frame to at least two selected output queue controllers in accordance with said mask". The office action asserts that Sindhu discloses this limitation at col. 6, lines 21-26 and col. 17, lines 5-15. However, as argued above regarding claim 1, col. 17 of Sindhu teaches a data structure associated with a notification which includes a mask. Further, Sindhu teaches sending a notification to more than one multi-function multiport. However, sending a notification to more than one multi-function multiport is not the same as "concurrently transferring a reference to **said frame** to **at least two selected output queue controllers**". (emphasis added). Therefore, because Sindhu does not teach every limitation recited in claim 8, claim 8 is patentable over Sindhu. As such, the anticipation rejection of claim 8 should be reversed.

For the five reasons set forth above, the rejection of claim 8 should be reversed.

Further, by virtue of their dependency on claim 8, claims 9-13 are patentable over Sindhu. As such, the anticipation rejection of claims 9-13 should be reversed.

Claim 14

As to claim 14, the office action fails to show that Sindhu teaches every limitation recited in claim 14 "in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim", as required by MPEP 2131. Further, the office action fails to clearly identify what portions of Sindhu teach all of the claimed limitations as required by 37 CFR 1.104(c)(2). Moreover, Sindhu fails to disclose, either expressly or

inherently, the limitations recited in claim 14. As such, the rejection of claim 14 should be reversed for at least the following four reasons.

First, as argued above regarding claim 8, the office action's assertion that Sindhu teaches the limitations of claim 8 is improper as the argument merges teachings from multiple unrelated and disjointed portions of Sindhu. More specifically, the office action combines teachings from cols. 3, 5, 6, 12, 17 as well as FIGS. 2A, 2B, 3A, 3C, 14. However, as argued above regarding claim 8, col. 6 and col. 17 of Sindhu relate to different aspects of the embodiments disclosed in Sindhu. For example, col. 6 describes functionality for a router, while col. 17 describes "a data structure associated with the notification outputted by the controller to the output switch". (Sindhu, col. 17, lines 5-7). Further, the cited figures relate to different embodiments of Sindhu. In particular, some of the cited figures are unrelated to the embodiments described in cols. 6 and 17. For example, FIGS. 3A and 3C relate to a multi-function multiport and a data structure for a cell transferred between a multi-function port and an input switch (Sindhu, col. 4, lines, 30-31 and col. 4, lines 35-37), and FIG. 14 relates to an output request transferred from the controller to the output switch. (Sindhu, col. 5, lines 26-28). As such, the office action fails to clearly explain which "particular part" of Sindhu discloses the limitations of claim 14 as required by 37 CFR 1.104(c)(2). Therefore, because the office action fails to make a prima facie case of anticipation, the rejection should be reversed.

Second, the office action fails to show where Sindhu teaches "a table having a **plurality of predetermined routes**, said table addressed by a destination ID in said frame, and said table comprising a mask corresponding to said destination ID" as recited in claim 14. (emphasis added). While the office action asserts Sindhu teaches "a routing table" at col. 5, line 62, the office action does not clearly identify where Sindhu teaches a table in the manner claimed in claim 14. That is, the office action does not clearly identify where Sindhu teaches "a table having a plurality of predetermined routes, said table addressed by a destination ID in said frame, and said table comprising a mask corresponding to said destination ID". Instead, the office action refers to extrinsic evidence of web pages at *themanualpage.org* and *developer.novell.com* to assert that "plurality of predetermined routes" is inherent in the definition of a routing table. However, such an

assertion is improper. The office action may not combine the teachings of Sindhu with extrinsic evidence in making an anticipation rejection under 102(e). As stated in MPEP 2131, a claim is anticipated only if every element is found in "a single prior art reference". Thus, the office action improperly refers to extrinsic evidence in asserting the anticipation rejection since the office action includes citations to references aside from Sindhu. As such, the office action fails to clearly explain which "particular part" of Sindhu discloses the limitations of claim 14 as required by 37 CFR 1.104(c)(2). Therefore, because the office action fails to make a prima facie case of anticipation, the rejection should be reversed.

Third, even if, in arguendo, the office action sufficiently asserted that Sindhu teaches "a plurality of predetermined routes", claim 14 is still patentable over Sindhu as Sindhu does not disclose the limitation "a plurality of predetermined routes". The office action asserted that "a plurality of predetermined routes" is taught by Sindhu at col. 3, lines 30-34. However, the cited portion of Sindhu merely refers to a Summary of the Invention section which does not mention a routing table or the claimed predetermined routes. More specifically, Sindhu teaches a method of storing a data packet in a router while an engine "determines the proper path through the router". (Sindhu, col. 3, lines 30-34). Sindhu simply teaches a method for determining a "proper path" for the data packet. As such, Sindhu does not disclose, either expressly or inherently, that such a method uses "a plurality of predetermined routes" as claimed. Therefore, because Sindhu does not teach every limitation recited in claim 14, claim 14 is patentable over Sindhu.

Fourth, the office action asserts that Sindhu teaches "selected output queue control modules for said plurality of selected output queues, said selected output queue control modules used for copying data to **said plurality of selected output queues**" as recited in claim 14. (emphasis added). The office action asserts that Sindhu's teaching that a read request is "transferred from a memory bank" discloses this limitation. However, Sindhu teaches using read requests to identify cell data which should be transferred from a memory bank to an output switch "for ultimate transfer to a **requesting multi-function multiport**." (emphasis added) (Sindhu, col. 12, lines 26-29). Sindhu teaches transferring data from the memory bank to an output switch and then transferring the data to a **requesting** multi-function multiport. However, claim 14 does not recite anything similar to using

read requests to transfer cell data to a requesting multi-function multiport. As such, Sindhu fails to teach the limitation for which it is cited. Therefore, because Sindhu does not teach every limitation recited in claim 14, claim 14 is patentable over Sindhu. As such, the anticipation rejection of claim 14 should be reversed.

For the four reasons argued above, the rejection of claim 14 should be reversed.

Further, by virtue of their dependency on claim 14, claims 15-21 are patentable over Sindhu. As such, the anticipation rejection of claims 15-21 should be reversed.

Claim 22

To the extent that independent claim 22 includes similar limitations to claims 1, 8, and 14, namely the "plurality of selected output ports" and the "multicast data structure having predetermined multicast routes" limitations, claim 22 is patentable over Sindhu for the same reasons claims 1, 8, and 14 are patentable over Sindhu. As such, the anticipation rejection of claim 22 should be reversed.

Further, by virtue of its dependency on claim 22, claim 24 is patentable over Sindhu. As such, the anticipation rejection of claim 24 should be reversed.

Claim 25

To the extent that independent claim 25 includes similar limitations to claims 1, 8, and 14, namely the "accessing a data structure comprising a mask for **said plurality of destinations**" and "concurrently transferring at least one portion of said frame from said source to **said selected destinations**" limitations, claim 25 is patentable over Sindhu for the same reasons claims 1, 8, and 14 are patentable over Sindhu. As such, the anticipation rejection of claim 25 should be reversed.

B. Rejection of Claims 23 under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sindhu in view of Sakamoto et al. (US Patent 6,836,479).

Claim 23 depends on claim 22 and thus inherits the limitations of claim 22. As argued above regarding the anticipation rejection of claim 22, Sindhu fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, all of the limitations recited in claim 22. In particular, Sindhu fails to disclose the

"plurality of selected output ports" and the "multicast data structure having predetermined multicast routes" limitations. Further, Sakamoto fails to cure these deficiencies. As such, claim 23 is patentable over the cited prior art.

CONCLUSION AND RELIEF

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The undersigned requests that the Board overturn the rejection of all claims and hold that all of the claims of the above referenced application are allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 17, 2006

M. Kala Sarvaiya
Reg. No. 58,912

Mark A. Goldstein
Reg. No. 50,759

SoCal IP Law Group
310 N. Westlake Blvd., Suite 120
Westlake Village, CA 91362
Telephone: 805/230-1350
Facsimile: 805/230-1355
email: info@socalip.com

(viii) CLAIMS APPENDIX

The claims involved in this Appeal are as follows:

1. A method for sending a data item from a source to selected destinations of a plurality of destinations in a switching network, said method comprising:

examining said data item to determine a routing identifier for said data item;

using said routing identifier as an index, accessing a data structure comprising routing control values for said plurality of destinations; and

concurrently transferring said data item from said source to said selected destinations based on said routing control values.

2. The method of claim 1 wherein said data structure comprises a table.

3. The method of claim 2 wherein said table comprises predetermined routing information.

4. The method of claim 1 wherein said data item comprises a portion of a frame.

5. The method of claim 1 wherein said routing control values is part of a mask.

6. The method of claim 1 wherein said source comprises an input queue.

7. The method of claim 1 wherein said switching network is part of a router.

8. A method for multicasting a frame in a router, said router comprising an input queue and a plurality of output queues, said method comprising:

determining a destination identifier for said frame received by said input queue;

using said destination identifier, locating a data structure comprising a mask for said plurality of output queues; and

concurrently transferring a reference to said frame to at least two selected output queue controllers in accordance with said mask.

9. The method of claim 8 further comprising: copying a word associated with said reference to said frame to selected output queues of said plurality of output queues corresponding to said selected output queue controllers.

10. The method of claim 8 wherein said data structure comprises a table, said table comprising said mask.

11. The method of claim 10 wherein said destination identifier is an index into said table for selecting said mask.

12. The method of claim 8 wherein said frame is stored in a shared memory and is located by said reference to said frame.

13. The method of claim 8 wherein said reference to said frame includes a pointer to said frame.

14. A multicasting system in a switching fabric for routing data in a frame received at an input queue to a plurality of selected output queues, comprising:

a table having a plurality of predetermined routes, said table addressed by a destination ID in said frame, and said table comprising a mask corresponding to said destination ID;

a memory for storing said mask, said mask indicating said plurality of selected output queues; and

selected output queue control modules for said plurality of selected output queues, said selected output queue control modules used for copying said data to said plurality of selected output queues.

15. The multicasting system of claim 14 further comprising:

a start of frame pointer for addressing a memory area in a shared memory having said frame, wherein said start of frame pointer is concurrently copied to said selected output queue modules.

16. The multicasting system of claim 14 wherein said frame has a frame format comprising: a type, a destination ID, and data.

17. The multicasting system of claim 14 wherein said frame has a frame format comprising: a type, a route, and user defined control information.

18. The multicasting system of claim 14 wherein said frame has a frame format comprising: a type, a route, and data.

19. The multicasting system of claim 18 wherein said route includes a multicast flow ID.

20. The multicasting system of claim 18 wherein said route includes a unicast destination port ID.

21. The multicasting system of claim 18 wherein said memory for storing said mask includes a lockable row.

22. A system for multicasting a frame in a router having a plurality of input ports and a plurality of output ports, comprising:

a first crossbar switch for transferring said frame from an input port of said plurality of input ports to a shared memory; a frame pointer for referencing said frame stored in said shared memory;

a second crossbar switch for transferring said frame using said frame pointer to a plurality of selected output ports of said plurality of output ports; and

a control unit for selecting said plurality of selected output ports using a multicast data structure having predetermined multicast routes.

23. The system of claim 22 wherein transferring said frame using said frame pointer to a plurality of selected output ports happens in parallel.

24. The system of claim 22 wherein said control unit comprises a lockable cache memory for storing a mask, said mask used in selecting said plurality of selected output ports.

25. A method for sending a frame from a source to selected destinations of a plurality of destinations in a router, said method comprising:

means for examining said frame to determine a destination identifier for said frame;

using said destination identifier as an index, means for accessing a data structure comprising a mask for said plurality of destinations; and

means for concurrently transferring at least one portion of said frame from said source to said selected destinations based on said mask.

(ix) EVIDENCE APPENDIX

No evidence has been submitted pursuant to §§ 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 of this title. No other evidence has been entered by the examiner and relied upon by appellant in the appeal.

(x) RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

Since there are no applications currently being appealed that may directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal, there are no copies of decisions rendered by a court or the Board.